





C. McNEIL E SECRETARY

#### ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

DATE:

JULY 9, 2001

DOCKET NO:

T-03973A-00-1038

TO ALL PARTIES:

Enclosed please find the recommendation of Administrative Law Judge Dwight Nodes. The recommendation has been filed in the form of an Opinion and Order on:

# VIVO COMMUNICATIONS-AZ, LLC (CC&N/FACILITIES-BASED)

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-110(B), you may file exceptions to the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge by filing an original and ten (10) copies of the exceptions with the Commission's Docket Control at the address listed below by 4:00 p.m. on or before:

JULY 18, 2001

The enclosed is <u>NOT</u> an order of the Commission, but a recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge to the Commissioners. Consideration of this matter has <u>tentatively</u> been scheduled for the Commission's Working Session and Open Meeting to be held on:

JULY 24, 2001 AND JULY 25, 2001

For more information, you may contact Docket Control at (602) 542-3477 or the Hearing Division at (602)542-4250.

BRIAN C. McNEIL

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

#### 1 BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 2 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL **CHAIRMAN** 3 JIM IRVIN **COMMISSIONER** 4 MARC SPITZER COMMISSIONER 5 DOCKET NO. T-03973A-00-1038 6 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF VIVO COMMUNICATIONS-AZ, LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND DECISION NO. NECESSITY TO PROVIDE COMPETITIVE FACILITIES-BASED AND RESOLD LOCAL EXCHANGE, INTEREXCHANGE, AND ACCESS OPINION AND ORDER TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES. 10 DATE OF HEARING: June 21, 2001 11 PLACE OF HEARING: Phoenix, Arizona 12 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Dwight D. Nodes 13 APPEARANCES: Michael W. Patten, ROSHKA HEYMAN & DEWULF, on behalf of VIVO Communications-AZ, LLC; 14 Teena Wolfe, Staff Attorney, Legal Division, on behalf 15 of the Utilities Division of the Arizona Corporation Commission. 16 BY THE COMMISSION: 17 Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the 18 Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") finds, concludes, and orders that: 19 FINDINGS OF FACT 20 On December 19, 2000, VIVO Communications-AZ, LLC ("VIVO" or "Applicant") 1. 21 filed with the Commission an application for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity 22 ("Certificate") to provide competitive facilities-based and resold local exchange, interexchange, and 23

- 2. VIVO is an Arizona limited liability company, authorized to do business in Arizona.
- 3. On January 22, 2001, VIVO filed Affidavits of Publication indicating compliance with the Commission's notice requirements.
  - 4. On March 13, 2001, the Commission's Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") filed its Staff

24

25

26

27

28

access telecommunications services in Arizona.

(a)

unless its provides services solely through the use of its own facilities, VIVO should be ordered to procure an Interconnection Agreement before being allowed to offer local exchange service;

Report, which recommended approval of the application and included a number of additional recommendations.

- 5. On April 4, 2001, a Procedural Order was issued setting the matter for hearing on June 21, 2001.
- 6. A hearing was held on June 21, 2001, at which Applicant and Staff presented evidence. At the hearing, Staff made several minor changes to the Staff Report recommendations.
- 7. Qwest and VIVO have not yet executed an interconnection agreement, but such negotiations are expected to begin in the near future.
- 8. The management of VIVO has many years of experience in the telecommunications industry.
- 9. Applicant has the technical capability to provide the services that are proposed in its application.
- 10. Currently there are several incumbent providers of local exchange, toll, and exchange access services in the service territory requested by Applicant, and numerous other entities have been authorized to provide competitive local exchange services in all or portions of that territory.
  - 11. It is appropriate to classify all of Applicant's authorized services as competitive.
- 12. The Staff Report stated that Applicant has no market power and the reasonableness of its rates would be evaluated in a market with numerous competitors.
- 13. According to Staff, VIVO submitted the unaudited balance sheet of its sister company, VIVO-TN, LLC, as of November 30, 2000. These financial data list assets of \$106,293 and total shareholders' equity of \$106,293. Based on this information, Staff believes that VIVO lacks sufficient financial strength to offer the requested telecommunications services in Arizona absent the procurement of a performance bond.
- 14. Staff recommends, as amended, that VIVO's application for a Certificate to provide competitive facilities-based and resold telecommunications services be granted subject to the following conditions:
  - DECISION NO.

1 2	(b)	VIVO should be ordered to file with the Commission, within 30 days of an Order in this matter, its plan to have its customers' telephone numbers included in the incumbent's Directories and Directory Assistance databases;	
3	(c)	VIVO be ordered to pursue permanent number portability arrangements with other LECs pursuant to Commission rules, federal laws and federal rules;	
5	(d)	VIVO be ordered to abide by and participate in the AUSF mechanism instituted in Decision No. 59623, dated April 24, 1996 (Docket No. RT-T-03905A-00-0513E-95-0498);	
6 7	(e)	Applicant be ordered to abide by the quality of service standards that were approved by the Commission for USWC in Docket No. T-0151B-93-0183;	
8 9	(f)	in areas where Applicant is the sole provider of local exchange service facilities, VIVO be ordered to provide customers with access to alternative providers of service pursuant to the provisions of Commission rules, federal	
10		laws and federal rules;	
11	(g)	VIVO be ordered to certify, through the 911 service provider in the area in which it intends to provide service, that all issues associated with the provision of 911 service have been resolved with the emergency service providers within	
12		30 days of an Order in this matter;	
13 14	(h)	VIVO be ordered to abide by all the Commission decisions and policies regarding CLASS services;	
15	(i)	VIVO be ordered to provide 2-PIC equal access;	
16	(j)	VIVO be required to certify that all notification requirements have been completed prior to a final determination in this proceeding;	
17 18	(k)	VIVO be required to notify the Commission immediately upon changes to its address or telephone number;	
19	(1)	VIVO be ordered to comply with all Commission rules, orders, and other requirements relevant to the provision of intrastate telecommunications	
20		service;	
21	(m)	VIVO be ordered to maintain its accounts and records as required by the Commission;	
22	(n)	VIVO should be ordered file with the Commission all financial and other reports that the Commission may require, and in a form and at such times as	
23		the Commission may designate;	
24 25	(0)	VIVO maintain on file with the Commission all current tariffs and rates, and any service standards that the Commission may require;	
26	(p)	VIVO should be ordered to cooperate with Commission investigations of customer complaints;	
27 28	(q)	VIVO be ordered to participate in and contribute to a universal service fund, as required by the Commission; and	

- (r) In order to protect VIVO's customers:
  - (1) VIVO should be ordered to procure a performance bond equal to \$100,000. The minimum bond amount of \$100,000 should be increased if at any time it would be insufficient to cover prepayments or deposits collected from VIVO's customers;
  - (2) that if the Applicant desires to discontinue service, it should file an application with the Commission pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-1107;
  - (3) that the Applicant should be required to notify each of its customers and the Commission 60 days prior to filing an application to discontinue service pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-1107; and any failure to do so should result in forfeiture of the Applicant's performance bond;
  - (4) that proof of the performance bond should be docketed within 90 days of an Order in this matter or 30 days prior to the provision of service, whichever comes first, and must remain in effect; however,
  - (5) if, at some time in the future, the Applicant's financial outlook improves, Staff recommends that the Applicant be allowed to file a request for cancellation of its established performance bond. Such request should be accompanied by information demonstrating the Applicant's financial viability. Upon receipt of such filing and after Staff review, Staff will forward its recommendation to the Commission.
- 15. Staff further recommended that VIVO's tariffs be approved on an interim basis subject to the following:
  - (a) That VIVO file tariffs in accordance with this Decision within 30 days of an Order in this matter or within 30 days of an Order approving its interconnection agreement, whichever is later;
  - (b) That VIVO should be required to file in this Docket, within 18 months of the date it first provides service following certification, sufficient information for Staff analysis and recommendation for a fair value finding, as well as for an analysis and recommendation for permanent tariff approval. This information must include, at a minimum, the following:
    - 1. A dollar amount representing the total revenue for the first twelve months of telecommunications service provided to Arizona customers by VIVO following certification, adjusted to reflect the maximum rates that VIVO has requested in its tariff. This adjusted total revenue figure could be calculated as the number of units sold for all services offered times the maximum charge per unit.
    - 2. The total actual operating expenses for the first twelve months of telecommunications service provided to Arizona customers by VIVO

following certification.

- 3. The value of all assets, listed by major category, used for the first twelve months of telecommunications services provided to Arizona customers by VIVO following certification. Assets are not limited to plant and equipment. Items such as office equipment and office supplies should be included in this list.
- (c) VIVO's failure to meet the condition to timely file sufficient information for a fair value finding and analysis and recommendation of permanent tariffs should result in the expiration of the Certificate of Convenience and Necessity and of the tariffs.
- 16. At the hearing, VIVO agreed to comply with all of Staff's recommendations, but requested waivers of two of the timelines. VIVO requests that its conforming tariffs not be required until 30 days after an interconnection agreement is executed, instead of within 30 days from the date of this Order. The Applicant also requests that proof of the performance bond not be required until the earlier of 180 days from the issuance of this Order or 30 days prior to commencement of service. Staff does not oppose either of these requests. The Applicant indicated that it intends to begin operations in Arizona within six months.
- 17. On August 29, 2000, the Court of Appeals, Division One, ("Court") issued its Opinion in <u>U S West Communications</u>, Inc. vs. Arizona Corporation Commission, 1 CA-CV 98-0672, holding that "the Arizona Constitution requires the Commission to determine fair value rate bases for all public service corporations in Arizona prior to setting their rates and charges."
- 18. On October 26, 2000, the Commission filed a Petition for Review to the Arizona Supreme Court. On February 13, 2001, the Commission's Petition was granted. However, at this time we are going to request FVRB information to insure compliance with the Constitution should the ultimate decision of the Supreme Court affirm the Court's interpretation of Section 14. We also are concerned that the cost and complexity of FVRB determinations must not offend the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

## **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. Applicant is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and A.R.S. §§ 40-281 and 40-282.

- 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over Applicant and the subject matter of the application.
  - 3. Notice of the application was given in accordance with the law.
- 4. A.R.S. § 40-282 allows a telecommunications company to file an application for a Certificate to provide competitive telecommunications services.
- 5. Pursuant to Article XV of the Arizona Constitution as well as the Arizona Revised Statutes, it is in the public interest for Applicant to provide the telecommunications services set forth in its application.
- 6. Applicant is a fit and proper entity to receive a Certificate authorizing it to provide competitive facilities-based and resold local exchange, interexchange, and exchange access telecommunications services in Arizona as conditioned by Staff's recommendations as modified below.
- 7. The telecommunications services that the Applicant intends to provide are competitive within Arizona.
- 8. Pursuant to Article XV of the Arizona Constitution as well as the Competitive Rules, it is just and reasonable and in the public interest for Applicant to establish rates and charges which are not less than the Applicant's total service long-run incremental costs of providing the competitive services approved herein.
- 9. Staff's recommendations in Findings of Fact Nos. 14 and 15, as modified in accordance with Finding of Fact No. 16, are reasonable and should be adopted.

### **ORDER**

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the application of VIVO Communications-AZ, LLC for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for authority to provide competitive facilities-based and resold local exchange, and exchange access telecommunications services in Arizona shall be, and is hereby, granted, as conditioned herein.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the conforming tariffs of VIVO Communications-AZ, LLC shall be filed within 30 days after an interconnection agreement is executed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that VIVO Communications-AZ, LLC shall procure a performance bond equal to \$100,000 the earlier of 180 days from the effective date of this Order or 30 days prior to the commencement of service. The minimum bond amount of \$100,000 shall be increased if, at any time, it would be insufficient to cover prepayments or deposits collected from the Applicant's customers.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that VIVO Communications-AZ, LLC shall comply with all of the Staff recommendations set forth in Findings of Fact Nos. 14 and 15, as modified by Finding of Fact No. 16.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that VIVO Communications-AZ, LLC shall file with the Compliance Section of the Utilities Division a letter indicating the date on which it will begin providing service at least 60 days prior to providing service.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.

BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.

CHAIRMAN	COMMISSIONER	COMMISSIONER
	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BE Secretary of the Arizona Corhereunto set my hand and cau Commission to be affixed at the Cothis day of, 200	poration Commission, have sed the official seal of the apitol, in the City of Phoenix
	BRIAN C. McNEIL EXECUTIVE SECRETARY	
DISSENT DDN:mlj		

l					
1	SERVICE LIST FOR:	VIVO COMMUNICATIONS-AZ, LLC			
2	DOCKET NO.:	T-03973A-00-1038			
3					
4	Michael W. Patten				
5	ROSHKA HEYMAN & DEWULF 400 N. 5 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1000				
6	Phoenix, AZ 85004 Attorneys for VIVO Communications-AZ, LLC				
7					
8	Timothy Berg FENNEMORE CRAIG				
9	3003 North Central Avenue, Suite 2600				
10	Phoenix, Arizona 85012 Attorneys for Qwest Corporation				
11	Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel				
12	Legal Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION	ON			
13	1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007				
14	Deborah Scott, Director				
15	Utilities Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION	ON			
16	1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007				
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					